

Appl. No. 09/737,714  
Amdt. Dated November 7, 2003  
Reply to Office Action dated May 7, 2003

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-23 remain in this application.

Claims 1-5, 7, 11, 12, 14, 17-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sambamurthy et al. (US Patent 6,108,713). Claims 6, 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sambamurthy et al. in view of Allison et al. (US Patent 6,167,032). Claims 8, 9, 15, 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sambamurthy et al. in view of Allison et al. and further in view of Jame Martin (Enterprise network data link subnetwork). Claims 10, 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sambamurthy et al. in view of Allison et al. and further in view of World Movers (WM). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Independent claim 1 recites: "...an inter-module communication interface enabling communication between said plurality of operating modules." This feature is not shown or suggested by Sambamurthy et al. Claim 1 is therefore allowable. The Examiner refers to col. 24, lines 57-67 of Sambamurthy et al. However, this portion of Sambamurthy et al. clearly does not discuss or even suggest an inter-module communication interface enabling communication between said plurality of operating modules. Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least for the same reasons as claim 1.

Independent claim 12 recites: "...separating media access control layer operating functions into plurality of corresponding software-programmable operating modules." This feature is not shown or suggested by Sambamurthy et al. Claim 12 is therefore allowable. The Examiner refers to col. 14, lines 37-45 of Sambamurthy et al. However, this portion of Sambamurthy et al. clearly does not discuss or even suggest separating media access control layer operating functions into plurality of corresponding software-programmable operating modules. Claims 13-23 depend from claim 12 and are allowable at least for the same reasons as claim 12.

The Examiner is requested to provide Applicants with a copy of the Jame Martin (Enterprise network data link subnetwork) reference relied on to reject claims 8, 9, 15, 16. This

Appl. No. 09/737,714

Amdt. Dated November 7, 2003

Reply to Office Action dated May 7, 2003

reference was not cited on the form PTO-892 nor was a copy of this reference provided with the Office Action mailed May 7, 2003.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that a Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



W. James Brady III  
Registration No. 32,080  
Texas Instruments Incorporated  
(972) 917-4371